It is asserted that these amendments do not add new matter and are supported by the

specification and claims as originally filed. Entry of these claims is respectfully

requested.

Claims 12-19 have been rejected.

Claims 12, 16 and 18 have been amended.

Claims 13-15 and 17 are kept unchanged.

Claim 19 has been cancelled.

New claim 20 has been filed and finds support on page 25, lines 1-9 of the instant

specification.

Claims 12-18 and 20 are pending in the application.

Claims 12, 16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

Claim 12 has been amended as requested by the Examiner with formulas (II) and (III)

being presented like formula (I) and the phrase "(chlorine or fluorine)" has been

deleted.

Z1 finds support in amended claim 16 now dependent upon claim 14.

Amended claim 18 is now definite because it depends upon claim 12.

The rejections of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is now moot

because claim 19 has been canceled.

11

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner now reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 12, 16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process results in an improper definition of the process, is now moot because claim 19 has been canceled.

Claims 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ivoclar AG, Li (CA 2 232 960) in view of Priou (5,693,688).

The instant claimed dental composition comprises:

- (1) at least one crosslinkable or <u>polymerizable silicone oligomer or polymer</u> which is liquid at room temperature or which is heat-meltable at a temperature of less than 100°C, and which is defined by a specific chemical structure (I);
- (2) at least one dental filler present in a proportion of at least 10% by weight relative to the total weight of the composition, and
- (3) an effective quantity of at least one organometallic complex borate photoinitioator which cationic entity being of formula (II) and anionic borate being of formula III

 As stated by the Examiner CA 2 232 960 teaches dental material obtained from polymerizable and hydrolyzable oxetane silanes (please see page 1, lines 1-7).

 Therefore, that reference cannot teach dental composition comprising at least one crosslinkable or polymerizable silicone oligomer or polymer defined by a specific

chemical structure (I), being liquid at room temperature or being heat-meltable at a temperature of less than 100°C.

Silanes could not be assumed to be part of the silicone chemical family. Silanes belong to a utterly different class of chemicals. Applicant believes that such a major difference should be sufficient in itself to address the obviousness rejection.

Furthermore, as stated by the Examiner, that document does not disclose nor suggest borate salts of cyclopendadienyl iron or other organometallic cation.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been

motivated to use the borate salts taught by Priou et al. because Priou et al. focuss on antiadhesive coating compositions on solid supports of articles (e.g. paper or polymer film of the polyester or polyethylene), having nothing to do with dental compositions. This is confirmed by the examples of the Priou patent, all directed to antiadhesive coating compositions. In that connection, it is well known that a silicone composition has to have a proper viscosity for a coating application in order to be easily coated on supports. A dental silicone composition comprising more than 10% by weight of at least one dental filler is <u>not</u> suitable for high speed coating systems.

Moreover, Priou et al. do not disclose nor suggest that a silane could be replaced by a polymerizable silicone oligomer or polymer and that said silane could be used in a dental composition with a cyclopendadienyl iron or other organometallic cation.

The technical field relative to the production of antiadhesive coatings on solid supports is far away from the technical field of dental composition, the latter raising new issues such as the overall toxicity of the composition.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner now reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1219 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ivoclar AG, Li (CA 2 232 960) in view of Priou (5,693,688).

Claims 12-14,16, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt (5,401,528 or WO 92/16183)) in view of Priou (5,693,688).

The Schmidt patents disclose dental material obtained from polymerizable and hydrolyzable silanes (please see the abstracts and all the claims of the Schmidt patents). Therefore, the above rationale set forth above for CA 2 232 960, also applies to the Schmidt patents. The above rationale set forth above for Priou on the absence of motivation for combining the teachings of Schmidt and Priou, also applies to the combination of the teachings of Schmidt and Priou."

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner now reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 12-14,16, 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt (5,401,528 or WO 92/16183)) in view of Priou (5,693,688).

The rejection of claims 12-19 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4 of US Patent 6,747,071 or over claims 1-6 of US Patent 6,747,071 in view of Priou (5,693,688), is now moot because

Applicant is enclosing herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR

1.321 (c).

According to the OG Notice of 12/26/01 "Guidelines Setting Forth a Modified Policy,

the undersigned Agent of record makes the statement that the instant application and

the reference: US Patent 6,747,071 was, at the time the invention was made, owned

by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same person, either Rhone-

Poulenc Chimie or Rhodia-Chimie, keeping in mind that Rhone-Poulenc Chimie has

changed its name into Rhodia-Chimie on December 30th, 1997 as shown by the copy

of the Certificate of Change of Name herewith enclosed.

The rejection of claims 12-19 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of US Patent Application No.

10/781,064 is now moot because Applicants are herewith filing a terminal disclaimer

in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (c).

According to the OG Notice of 12/26/01 "Guidelines Setting Forth a Modified Policy,

the undersigned Agent of record makes the statement that the instant application and

the reference: US Patent Application No. 10/781,064 was, at the time the invention

was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same person,

either Rhone-Poulenc Chimie or Rhodia-Chimie, keeping in mind that Rhone-Poulenc

Chimie has changed its name into Rhodia-Chimie on December 30th, 1997 as shown

by the copy of the Certificate of Change of Name herewith enclosed.

15

RN98132

Serial number: 09/806,648

AMENDMENT

In view of the preceding remarks, it is asserted that the patent application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any question concerning these remarks that would further advance prosecution of the claims to allowance, the examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned agent at (609) 860-4180. A notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

By_

April 07, 2005

Rhodia Inc. 259 Prospect Plains Road CN7500 Cranbury, NJ 08512 Respectfully submitted,

Jean-Louis SHUGNET

Limited Recognition under 37 CFR §

10.9(b) enclosed.

Tel: (609) 860-4180 Fax: (609) 860-0503